| 1  |   |                        |
|----|---|------------------------|
| 2  |   |                        |
| 2  |   |                        |
| 4  |   |                        |
| 5  |   |                        |
| 6  |   |                        |
| 7  |   |                        |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |                        |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |                        |
| 10 |   |                        |
| 11 | JABBARI McELROY,  | No. 2:15-cv-0904-EFB P |
| 12 | Plaintiff,  |                        |
| 13 | v.  | <u>ORDER</u>           |
| 14 | N. ASAD, et al.,  |                        |
| 15 | Defendants.   |                        |
| 16 |   |                        |
| 17 | Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42  |                        |
| 18 | U.S.C. § 1983. <sup>1</sup> On June 17, 2015, the court recommended that this action be dismissed because   |                        |
| 19 | plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee or submit an application for leave to proceed in forma   |                        |
| 20 | pauperis. ECF No. 5. Thereafter, plaintiff filed an application for leave to proceed in forma   |                        |
| 21 | pauperis (IFP) and consented to proceed before the undersigned for all purposes. ECF Nos. 6, 7.   |                        |
| 22 | In light of plaintiff's IFP application, the June 17, 2015 recommendation is vacated. But as  |                        |
| 23 | explained below, plaintiff has not demonstrated he is eligible to proceed in forma pauperis and   |                        |
| 24 | this action must therefore be dismissed.  |                        |
| 25 | /////   |                        |
| 26 |   |                        |
| 27 | <sup>1</sup> This proceeding was referred to this court by Local Rule 302 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and is before the undersigned pursuant to plaintiff's consent. <i>See</i> E.D. Cal. Local |                        |
| 28 | Rules, Appx. A, at $(k)(4)$ .   | -                      |
|    |   | 1                      |

| 1      | A prisoner may not proceed in forma pauperis:  |  |
|--------|--|--|
| 2      | if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in   |  |
| 3      | dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim<br>upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of<br>serious physical injury. |  |
| 4<br>5 |  |  |
|        | 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Court records reflect that on at least three prior occasions, plaintiff has   |  |
| 6<br>7 | brought actions while incarcerated that were dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or for failure to  |  |
| 7      |  |  |
| 8      | state a claim upon which relief may be granted. See (1) McElroy v. Gebbmedin, No. 1:08-cv-   |  |
| 9      | 0124-LJO-GSA (E.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008) (order dismissing action for failure to state a claim);   |  |
| 10     | (2) McElroy v. Schultz, No. 1:08-cv-0179-OWW-MJS (E.D. Cal. Apr. 30, 2010) (order  |  |
| 11     | dismissing action for failure to state a claim); (3) McElroy v. CDC, 2:08-cv-0733-HWG (E.D.  |  |
| 12     | Cal. June 3, 2009) (order dismissing action for failure to state a claim); and (4) <i>McElroy v</i> .  |  |
| 13     | Ground, No. 1:13-cv-483-MJS (E.D. Cal. Nov. 1, 2013) (order dismissing action for failure to   |  |
| 14     | state a claim). See also McElroy v. Turner, No. 2:12-cv-1182-CMK (E.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2012)   |  |
| 15     | (order designating plaintiff a three strikes litigant pursuant to § 1915(g)).  |  |
| 16     | The section 1915(g) exception applies if the complaint makes a plausible allegation that   |  |
| 17     | the prisoner faced "imminent danger of serious physical injury" at the time of filing. 28 U.S.C.   |  |
| 18     | § 1915(g); Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047, 1055 (9th Cir. 2007). For the exception to   |  |
| 19     | apply, the court must look to the conditions the "prisoner faced at the time the complaint was   |  |
| 20     | filed, not at some earlier or later time." Andrews, 493 F.3d at 1053, 1056 (requiring that prisoner  |  |
| 21     | allege "an ongoing danger" to satisfy the imminency requirement). Courts need "not make an   |  |
| 22     | overly detailed inquiry into whether the allegations qualify for the exception." Id. at 1055.  |  |
| 23     | Here, plaintiff's allegations do not demonstrate that he suffered from an ongoing or   |  |
| 24     | imminent danger of serious physical injury at the time he filed his complaint. See ECF No. 1   |  |
| 25     | (including allegations regarding an inadequate administrative appeals process and unlawful   |  |
| 26     | property searches and seizures). Thus, the imminent danger exception does not apply. Plaintiff's   |  |
| 27     | application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis must therefore be denied pursuant to § 1915(g).   |  |
| 28     | ////   |  |
|        | 2  |  |

| 1  | Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that   |
|----|--|
| 2  | 1. The June 17, 2015 findings and recommendations (ECF No. 5) are vacated;               |
| 3  | 2. Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 7) is denied; and       |
| 4  | 3. This action is dismissed without prejudice to re-filing upon pre-payment of the \$400 |
| 5  | filing fee.  |
| 6  | DATED: September 23, 2015.   |
| 7  | EDMUND F. BRENNAN<br>UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE                                      |
| 8  |  |
| 9  |  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| 26 |  |
| 27 |  |
| 28 | 3  |